

**SUMMARY OF THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

The Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Board (ELAB) met on Friday, November 3, 2000, at 9:00 a.m. Pacific Standard Time (PST) during the Sixth NELAC Interim Meeting (NELAC 6i) in Las Vegas, NV. The meeting was led by its chair, Dr. Wilson Hershey of Lancaster Laboratories, Inc. A list of action items is given in Attachment A and a list of previous action items is given in Attachment B. A list of participants is given in Attachment C. The meeting's agenda is given in attachment D. *The purpose of the meeting was to discuss issues of importance as highlighted in the prepared agenda distributed in meeting packets.*

**INTRODUCTION**

The meeting was called to order by ELAB's Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Dr. Stephen Billets of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Dr. Billets then turned the meeting over to Dr. Hershey, who welcomed attendees and reviewed the meeting agenda. Following an introduction of ELAB members, the minutes from the June 28, 2000, and August 22, 2000, meetings were reviewed. The June 28, 2000, minutes were accepted as written. The August 22, 2000, minutes were accepted pending minor revision. The status of action items from the two meetings was also reviewed. Their disposition is summarized in Attachment B.

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Performance Based Measurement Systems (PBMS) Subcommittee - Dr. Harry Gearhart, Chair**

Dr. Gearhart reported that the subcommittee has prepared two work products. The first is a straw model for the implementation of PBMS, which was presented to the Conference at the Opening Plenary. The second consists of a critical review article on PBMS, which summarizes the development of PBMS from the early 1990's to the present. It was suggested that the critical review article be developed into a journal article. Dr. Gearhart thanked the individuals who assisted in the preparation of the two work products. Following Dr. Gearhart's introduction of the straw model and critical review article, Mr. David Friedman of EPA presented comments on the straw model. Mr. Friedman's presentation included some background on the PBMS approach and clarification of the process. He noted that under the precepts of PBMS the laboratory is an arm of the regulated entity. The laboratory must demonstrate and document that its measurement system is appropriate for its intended purpose by reporting method quality indicators (bias, precision, sensitivity, and selectivity) with the analytical results. Mr. Friedman noted that required methods and PBMS will coexist for a number of years. Since EPA does not have the resources to rewrite all the existing regulations, PBMS will probably be implemented as new regulations are written. For this reason the NELAC system needs to accommodate both the required-method approach and the PBMS approach. The NELAC system must explicitly address situations in which a laboratory is accredited for one specific method and wants to report results from a modified method as an accredited laboratory.

Following Mr. Friedman's presentation, it was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously that

**upon completion of a review by the members of ELAB, the straw model for implementation of PBMS, the critical review of the EPA PBMS initiative, and Mr. Friedman's comments be forwarded to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee for their consideration for incorporation into the Quality Systems Standard.**

There was some discussion of whether it would be beneficial to consolidate the documents into one report. Mr. Scott Siders, chair of the NELAC Quality Systems Committee, indicated that his committee would be able to work with the separate documents as written. It was agreed that the ELAB PBMS Subcommittee will keep as an action item a review of the straw model and critical review article to identify significant differences. The subcommittee will also collate comments received after the presentation of the straw model for submission to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee.

**Air Source Emissions Task Team (ASETT) Subcommittee- Dr. Allen Verstuyft, ELAB Liaison, and Mr. Scott Evans, Chair**

Dr. Verstuyft reviewed the proposed schedule for the draft source emissions standard that was included in meeting packets. He explained that it is the goal of the subcommittee to reach consensus on the present (September 19, 2000) draft by January 19, 2001, to have completed a draft including an assessment process by May 2001, to reach consensus on that draft by September 1, 2001, and to have a complete draft standard made available to stakeholders by NELAC 7i.

Dr. Verstuyft then introduced Mr. Evans who reviewed the history, philosophy, and key points of the distributed draft of a source emissions standard, and explained that the quest for a standard for stack testing is actually very old and contentious. At a meeting of the NELAC Field Activities Measurement of Source Emissions (MSE) Subcommittee in Research Triangle Park, NC, in the summer of 2000, it was decided to work on the issue as a subcommittee of ELAB, which was formed as the Air Source Emission Task Team (ASETT). ASETT is a broad-based group of over 200 people. Mr. Evans noted that only 2 of the 50 states have moved to accreditation of stack testers. For this reason ASETT approached the development of a standard as an opportunity to rethink some of the assumptions about accreditation. ASETT's philosophy of accreditation is that accreditation should be performance-based and should take a quality systems approach. He noted that the performance-based standard is separate from PBMS, defining it as a standard by which objectives are measurable and the methods to achieve those objectives are not explicitly stated. Mr. Evans also noted that with a true quality systems approach, the need for methods-based accreditation disappears. The effort to produce a source emissions standard has two parts – a standard of performance, which has been drafted, and an assessment system, which has not yet been drafted. In consideration of the assessment system, the roles of the assessor (focused on the quality system) and the observer (focused on project-specific measurement activities) come into play. Mr. Evans noted that most states already have observers in place and suggested that feedback from the observers already in place should be made a part of the system. He communicated ASETT's perspective that the standard of performance sets guidelines while the more detailed information should be included in the method.

The document drafted by ASETT is based on ISO 17025. It is presented in two-column format with the standard of performance on the left and the assessment of performance on the right. Mr. Evans suggested that the assessment portion is more controversial than the standard. He also reviewed ASETT's vote on the standard, noting that almost all sections were approved by a margin of at least four to one. Most members of ASETT believe that ASETT is on the right track. Those members that do not believe that ASETT is on the right track often believe that ASETT is being too prescriptive.

Mr. Evans noted that, upon his request, the American Society for Testing & Materials (ASTM) formed a task group, which he is chairing, to prepare a standard on stack testing. ASETT is participating in the process to minimize divergence between standards.

In conclusion Dr. Verstuyft pointed out that the document is still a draft and has not yet been recommended by ELAB. The proposed standard will be reviewed by ELAB before it is passed along to the NELAC Field Activities Committee. Although there was no time for questions from the floor, Dr. Hershey promised Dr. Verstuyft and Mr. Evans at least an hour of time during ELAB's next teleconference.

#### **Regulatory Consistency Subcommittee - Ms. Zonetta English, Chair**

Ms. English noted that changes in regard to matrix spikes in Appendix D.1 of the NELAC Quality Systems standard (Chapter 5) create problems in consistency between methods and the NELAC Standard. After discussion of the issue, it was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously that

**ELAB recommend to the NELAC Regulatory Coordination Committee that the ELAB Regulatory Consistency Subcommittee work together to examine consistency issues arising from changes to Appendix D.1 and make recommendations for resolution of these conflicts to the appropriate NELAC standing committees.**

It was noted that, although the ELAB Regulatory Consistency Subcommittee will compile and provide their recommendations, the NELAC Regulatory Coordination Committee will take the lead on this effort.

#### **National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) Accrediting Authority Workgroup - Represented by Mr. David Mendenhall**

Mr. Jerry Parr explained that he had invited Mr. Mendenhall to review some of the Accrediting Authority Workgroup decisions presented during the opening plenary, with emphasis on decisions that affect implementation. Mr. Mendenhall reviewed the following decisions, which are also available on the NELAC Website:

7/11/00	Decision that laboratories may use a single method standard operating procedure (SOP) for a group of equivalent methods as long as relevant program requirements are met or exceeded.
---------	---

8/8/00 Decision to recognize interim accreditation status - Mr. Mendenhall noted that there had been some concern that some accrediting authorities have regulations prohibiting them from recognizing interim accreditation.

“Quick response” proficiency testing (PT) samples - It was noted that this was a recommendation to the NELAC Proficiency Testing Committee.

Decision that a problem found in the process of corrective action or that has completed corrective action should not be listed as a finding - In discussion of the decision on self-identified deficiencies, members of ELAB suggested that the workgroup add a caveat regarding the timing of corrective actions (has the deficiency been on record for years?) and a caveat stipulating that the corrective action, itself, must meet the requirements of the program.

10/13/00 Policy on effective date of implementation of the NELAC Standard - a recommendation to the NELAC Board of Directors.

C Standards become effective two years after adoption by the Conference.

C A NELAC standing committee may propose an effective date that is less than two years.

In discussion from the floor it was noted that the accrediting authorities' decisions are forwarded to the appropriate NELAC standing committees and that some of the committees have clarified their standards. It was also noted that the decisions discussed at the Sixth NELAC Annual Meeting (NELAC 6) have been put into practice by the accrediting authorities. A commenter suggested that consensus accrediting authority decisions be incorporated into the NELAC Standard so that future accrediting authorities do not revisit the same issues and arrive at potentially different decisions. It was suggested that accrediting authority decisions could be incorporated into the NELAC Standard as an Appendix to Chapter 6 (Accrediting Authority). After moderate discussion it was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously that

**ELAB recommend that the NELAC Board of Directors work toward a system for more timely publication of accrediting authority decisions on the NELAC Website and toward a mechanism for incorporating the decisions into the NELAC Standard.**

#### **UPDATE ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DOT)/EPA SAMPLE SHIPPING ISSUES**

Mr. David Friedman reviewed for ELAB the progress to date on the sample shipping issue. He reported that he had met with representatives of DOT and that a change of DOT regulations is not an option. It was decided that a possible solution to the problem might be to get DOT to agree with EPA that the preserved samples are not corrosive. Although the contractor working with Mr. Friedman's office on the issue attempted to assemble information supporting that position, she was unable to find much information on the corrosivity of the preserved samples. Therefore, EPA designed a study to

gather the necessary information to support the argument that not only are the preserved samples not corrosive but also that reasonable error in adding too much chemical preservative to the sample does not make it corrosive. The proposed Corrositex<sup>®</sup> test utilizes a cell culture to mimic the effects of the chemicals on skin. Mr. Friedman distributed two handouts constituting a draft cover letter and a proposed test design. He requested that members of ELAB submit comments to him by Tuesday, November 7, 2000, so that the documents may be forwarded to DOT for their comments. In response to questions of what steps could be taken if the chemical concentrations do prove to be corrosive, Mr. Friedman responded that there are really only two options. The laboratory community can follow the DOT shipping regulations or readdress the issue of chemical preservation, i.e., do water samples need to be preserved? He noted that the second option would be a major change to 25 years of preservation guidance. A member of ELAB noted that it should be made explicitly clear to DOT and the laboratory community that the corrosivity tests deal strictly with the preservation issue. In discussion of the issue from the floor, it was noted that shipping sample containers to the client is not at issue because of small quantity exemptions. Commenters from two laboratories offered to share with ELAB items including correspondence with DOT and copies of a legal opinion concerning shipment issues. Dr. Hershey encouraged all individuals with pertinent information to forward the information to Mr. Friedman.

#### **UPDATE ON PT ACTIVITIES**

Ms. Elaine Lemoine read a report on the status of previously reported issues regarding the NELAC PT program submitted by the NELAC PT Committee chair, Ms. Barbara Burmeister. The issues and subsequent discussion are summarized as follows:

- C      No defined entity at the present time who will designate an organization as a Proficiency Testing Oversight Board (PTOB)/Proficiency Test Provider Accreditor (PTPA)  
  
The NELAC PT standard was changed to enable any NELAP accrediting authority to designate a PTOB/PTPA. There has been no movement from any NELAP accrediting authority at this time. It is the PT Committee's understanding that the American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA) PT Provider Accreditation Program is functional and one PT provider has completed an A2LA on-site assessment.
- C      Lack of oversight from the National Institute of Standards and Technology/National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NIST/NVLAP); no response to date from NIST/NVLAP regarding results of PT provider analyses  
  
This is still an issue. The NELAC PT Committee is working with NIST/NVLAP regarding a mechanism to measure equivalency of PT samples and to determine other Chapter 2 requirements that are not currently being met by NIST/NVLAP.
- C      No PT provider caucus scheduled to date; There is a real need to share technical information and potential problems between stakeholders in an informal arena.

No change. The PT Committee sponsored a meeting of stakeholders in September 2000 to discuss PT implementation and standardization issues. At NELAC 6i the committee learned that a NIST/EPA meeting has been scheduled for August 16, 2001.

- C No feedback to date from EPA for provider data submitted on computer discs since October 1999

EPA has contacted PT providers regarding electronic data format issues.

- C No PT database to date; when operational, database will be limited to water analytes per EPA so there will be no oversight of solid waste analytes

No change. This is still a major issue.

- C Inconsistency between Scope of Accreditation and PT Fields of Testing is still a problem for laboratories and accrediting authorities due to reciprocity recognition issues

In progress. This issue has been discussed in length at NELAC 6i.

Dr. Hershey noted that Mr. Robert Graves of EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD)/Cincinnati office and Ms. Reenie Parris of NIST will be present at the Seventh NELAC Annual Meeting (NELAC 7) to provide more information on PT issues. He then opened the issues for discussion. Members of ELAB expressed the need to schedule substantive time at their next (January 9, 2001) teleconference to discuss PT issues. Dr. Hershey urged all interest parties to forward comments on PT issues to ELAB in the next few weeks for discussion at the teleconference.

#### **UPDATE ON ASTM ISSUES**

Dr. Llewellyn Williams noted that standards, such as NELAC's, address "what to do," and that guidance on "how to do" is needed. He then presented information on the work by ASTM to develop guidance on determining and documenting data quality. He explained that concerned parties thought it would be useful if guidance on how to demonstrate and document that a test method selected for a specific application is producing the data needed came from a recognized standard-producing body such as ASTM. Coincidentally, ASTM had already formed a task group under Committee D34 to work on this issue. When examining the task group's work product, it quickly became apparent that the ASTM standard is aimed at professional chemists with a great deal of professional judgement. Not every laboratory is populated with professional chemists with the professional judgement necessary to select and verify a test method. Therefore, a decision tree approach to demonstrating and documenting bias, precision, sensitivity, and selectivity for the selected method has also been prepared. The decision tree is designed to support the standard and reinforce the professional judgement of the chemist. It is not only meant for the laboratory, but also for data users. Dr. Williams reviewed the decision tree. Each section of the decision tree is divided into laboratory perspective and user perspective. Mr. Friedman is working on the standards and Dr. Williams is working on the decision tree. They hope to deliver drafts of both documents for critical review by Committee D34 before Thanksgiving 2000. After the review by Committee D34, the documents will progress to the next level of balloting. Final approval or adoption could potentially occur by Thanksgiving 2001.

A commenter questioned whether, if incorporated into Chapter 5 of the NELAC Standard, use of the ASTM standard would require payment of a royalty to ASTM. Although subsequent discussion indicated that NELAC can incorporate the ASTM standard by reference, there was no definitive answer to the question if NELAC wishes to copy the ASTM standard. Mr. Friedman commented that his past experience with similar situations leads him to believe that any fee would be nominal. It was also noted that the decision tree is not a formal ASTM document and would not be subject to a royalty fee.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS ON NELAC STANDARD**

The members of ELAB had no recommendations on the NELAC Standard at this time.

## **OPEN FORUM ISSUES**

Dr. Hershey enumerated issues that were raised in the ELAB Open Forum which was held on the evening of November 2, 2000. Their disposition is summarized as follows:

1. Timely system for communicating decisions made by accrediting authorities  
ELAB noted that this issues had been satisfactorily addressed discussions earlier in the ELAB meeting.
2. Sampler accreditation issues
  - C Proposed Field Activities standard will require that samplers associated with laboratories be accredited, but not others (engineering firms, etc.)
  - C Suggestion that ELAB look at alternative to accreditation - look at underlying test methodology
  - C Suggestion that ELAB recommend to NELAC that NELAC adopt an open teleconference policy - especially important for small testing companies that cannot attend meetings or update adequately via the web

These issues were deferred to a future teleconference.
3. PT issues
  - C Financially burdensome
  - C Redundant
  - C Coordination between PT programs
  - C Timing/scheduling
  - C Availability
  - C Implementation of new standards

- C Cost of numerous methods - encourage EPA to consolidate methods

These issues were merged with other PT issues for discussion in ELAB's January 9, 2001 teleconference.

- 4. Suggestion to consider move from MDLs to sensitivity demonstrations, instrument-specific detection limits

This issue was deferred to ELAB's January 9, 2001 teleconference for discussion of the possible formation of a subcommittee.

- 5. ISO Copyright issues

Dr. Hershey reported that Mr. Parr and Dr. Mark Marcus have expressed interest in this issue. They will investigate ISO copyright issues and report back to ELAB.

- 6. Implementation issues

- C Inconsistent interpretation of standards at on-site assessment

- C Suggestion of advisory committee for interpretation

These issues were deferred to a future teleconference.

- 7. DOT/Shipping issues still a concern

This was deemed an ongoing issue.

- 8. Mobile laboratory issues

- C Mobile vs field

- C Mobile vs fixed

Ms. English referred to concerns expressed in the NELAC Accreditation Process and Field Activities Committee meetings and in the ELAB Open Forum. She noted that key players include the state of California, which has over 200 mobile laboratories, and the state of Louisiana, which is implementing stack testing accreditation. Ms. English noted that although the NELAC Accreditation Process and Field Activities Committees have made a good start, there is concern that the committees are digressing. After moderate discussion, it was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously that

**ELAB recommend that the NELAC Field Activities Committee clearly define “sampling” and “field measurement activities” and that they work with the NELAC Accreditation Process Committee to ensure that there is no overlap in what is defined as “field measurement” versus “laboratory measurement.” It is clear that the definition of mobile laboratories and the accreditation of those entities is the responsibility of the Accreditation Process Committee.**

- 9. MCDB position paper (J. Parr)

Mr. Parr reported that the Methods and Data Comparability Board (MCDB), a federal advisory committee, is preparing a position paper on the accreditation of federal laboratories. The MCDB recommends that all federal laboratories (and commercial laboratories employed by the federal government) performing analytical testing for ambient water and compliance monitoring should be accredited. The position paper makes three recommendations for NELAP:

- C NELAP should make an effort to involve more states as accrediting authorities.
- C NELAP should address standards for ambient water monitoring.
- C NELAP should make an effort to identify federal accrediting authorities.

Mr. Parr noted that the position paper should be available for distribution in March 2001. He suggested that the relationship between ELAB and MCDB be formalized with a liaison. The issue was deferred for discussion at a future teleconference.

#### 10. PBMS issues

- C Request for clarification as to what ELAB envisions effects of PBMS on drinking water to be
- C Straw Model (D. Friedman)

These issues were addressed in the Open Forum

#### **CONCLUSION**

The allotted time for the meeting having come to a close, Dr. Hershey thanked the members of ELAB and the audience for their input. He relinquished control of the meeting to Dr. Billets. The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Billets shortly before 12:30 p.m. PST.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The next two teleconferences are scheduled for Tuesday, January 9, 2001, and Thursday, March 8, 2001, from 1:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST).

**ACTION ITEMS**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date to be Completed</b>
1	ELAB will schedule teleconferences for Tuesday, January 9, 2001, and Thursday, March 8, 2001, from 1:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST).	
2.	ELAB PBMS Subcommittee will consider developing critical review of PBMS initiative into journal article.	
3.	ELAB PBMS Subcommittee will forward critical review, straw model, and Mr. David Friedman's comments to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee.	
4.	ELAB PBMS Subcommittee will collate comments received after presentation of straw model at NELAC 6i Opening Plenary and forward them to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee.	
5.	ELAB will devote substantive time to discussion of ASETT's draft source emissions standard on its 01/09/01 teleconference agenda.	01/09/01
6.	ELAB will devote substantive time to other sampler accreditation issues (competitive business advantage arising from proposed standard's requirement that samplers associated with laboratories be accredited, suggestion that ELAB look at underlying test methodology as alternative to accreditation, suggestion that ELAB recommend that NELAC adopt an open teleconference policy, etc.) on agenda for future teleconference.	03/08/01
7.	ELAB will recommend to the NELAC Regulatory Coordination Committee that the ELAB Regulatory Consistency Subcommittee work with them to examine apparent consistency issues arising from matrix spike changes to Chapter 5 Appendix D.1 and make recommendations to the appropriate NELAC standing committees for resolution of these conflicts.	

**ACTION ITEMS (CONTINUED)**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date to be Completed</b>
8.	ELAB will recommend that the NELAC Board of Directors work toward a system for more timely publication of accrediting authority decisions on the NELAC Website and toward a mechanism for incorporating the decisions into the NELAC Standard.	
9.	ELAB will submit comments on draft corrosivity study design and cover letter to Mr. David Friedman for incorporation into documents to be submitted to DOT.	11/07/00
10.	ELAB will devote substantive time to discussion of PT issues on its 01/09/01 teleconference agenda.	01/09/01
11.	ELAB will consider suggestion to consider move from MDLs to sensitivity demonstrations, instrument-specific detection limits.	01/09/01
12.	Mr. Parr and Mr. Marcus will investigate ISO copyright issues and report to ELAB.	01/09/01
13.	ELAB will consider implementation issues, including inconsistent interpretation of standards at on-site assessment and suggestion of advisory committee for interpretation.	03/08/01
14.	ELAB will recommend that the NELAC Field Activities Committee clearly define "sampling" and "field measurement activities" and that they work with the NELAC Accreditation Process Committee to ensure that there is no overlap of what is defined as "field measurement" versus "laboratory measurement." It is clear that the definition of mobile laboratories and the accreditation of those entities is the responsibility of the Accreditation Process Committee.	
15.	ELAB will consider recommendations to NELAP outlined in MCDB position paper to be distributed in March 2001, and will consider mechanism for coordinating with MCDB (i.e. committee liaison).	03/08/01

**PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS  
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD  
NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Disposition as of 11/3/00</b>
1	6/28/00	PBMS Subcommittee will complete critical review of the EPA PBMS Initiative.	Completed
2	6/28/00	Third-Party Assessor Credentials Subcommittee will complete revised charter.	Subcommittee Disbanded
3	6/28/00	Scope of Accreditation and QC Standards Subcommittee reports will be posted on the NELAC Website.	Ongoing
4	6/28/00	ASSETT will complete draft MSE Standard for ELAB review.	Completed
5	6/28/00	Mr. Friedman will distribute DOT petition packet information to ELAB.	Ongoing
6	6/28/00	Ms. Hull will serve as ELAB liaison to the NELAC <i>ad hoc</i> PT subcommittee on PT standardization issues.	Ongoing
7	6/28/00	Dr. Hershey will draft a letter on behalf of ELAB to Mr. Robert Graves of EPA's Cincinnati office requesting an interim status report on the externalization of the WS/WP PT program.	Completed
8	6/28/00	ELAB will consider suggestion that they form a subcommittee to examine database needs and make recommendations for the consolidation of the NELAC National Database and PT Database(s) to eliminate redundant information.	Ongoing
9	6/28/00	ELAB will revisit issue of mobile laboratory accreditation after implementation of ISO 17025 into NELAC Standards.	Ongoing
10	6/28/00	ELAB will recommend that the NELAC Quality Systems Committee assemble a cross-sectional group of microbiologists to give practical input on Appendix D.3.	Completed
11	6/28/00	ELAB will refer two-tiered states subcontracting issue to NELAP Accrediting Authorities for resolution of apparent conflict.	Completed
12	6/28/00	Mr. Parr and Mr. Wibby will collaborate with Ms. Hankins to produce an overview of NELAC suitable for presentation to new participants at NELAC meetings.	Completed
13	8/22/00	EPA will reiterate its commitment to the NELAC/NELAP program (Henry Longest).	Completed - N6i 10/31/00

**PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS (CONTINUED)**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Disposition as of 11/3/00</b>
14	8/22/00	The Membership and Outreach committee will be given <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• results of the survey (Ms. Taunton), and</li><li>• the white paper (Mr. Parr, see recommendation #46).</li></ul>	Completed Deferred to MCDB
15	8/22/00	The laboratory community will share available information on impacts of low-concentration samples (e.g., on aluminum, steel, skin) with Mr. Friedman regarding shipment of acid-preserved samples.	Ongoing
16	8/22/00	Mr. Friedman was encouraged to obtain formal clarification of DOT's sample headspace interpretation.	Ongoing
17	8/22/00	Dr. Gearhart will expand the PBMS subcommittee's membership to include regulators.	Completed
18	8/22/00	Regarding the PBMS course for regulation-writers, Mr. Friedman will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• attempt to obtain permission, and</li><li>• will share the course with ELAB if possible.</li></ul>	Permission not granted
19	8/22/00	Mr. Parr will Email his completed regulatory consistency review to ELAB for the Hazardous Waste Identification Rule (HWIR).	No longer relevant
20	8/22/00	Dr. Hershey will contact MSE subcommittee members to determine progress.	Called Al Verstuft

**PARTICIPANTS**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 3, 2000**

Name		Affiliation	Address
Hershey, J. Wilson	Chair	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	T: (717) 656 - 2300 F: (717) 656 - 0450 E: jwhershey@lancasterlabs.com
Bigmeat, John		Cherokee Nation Water Treatment Plant	T: (828) 497-3005 F: (828) 497-3268 E: johnbigm@dnet.net
Billets, Steve (DFO)		USEPA/ORD	T: (702) 798-2232 F: (702) 798-2261 E: billets.stephen@epamail.epa.gov
English, Zonetta		Louisville Jefferson Co., MSD	T: (502) 540-6706 F: (502) 540-6779 E: english@msdlouky.org
Gearhart, Harry		Dupont	T: (405) 372-7575 F: (405) 372-4828 E: harry.l.gearhart@usa.dupont.com
Hull, Connie (absent)		Kansas City Water Services Lab	T: (816) 513-7000 F: (816) 513-7001 E: connie_hull@kcmo.org
LeMoine, Elaine		PerkinElmer Instruments	T: (203) 761-2771 F: (203) 761-2887 E: lemoinea@perkin-elmer.com
Marcus, Mark		Fluor Hanaford	T: (509) 373-3026 F: (509) 372-0456 E: mark_f_marcus@apimc01.rl.gov
McClure, David (absent)		ART Instruments, Inc.	T: (541) 472-0190 F: (541) 472-0196 E: dmccclure@artinstruments.com
Parr, Jerry		Catalyst Info. Resources, L.L.C.	T: (303) 670-7823 F: (303) 670-2964 E: catalyst@eazy.net
Peel, Tom (absent)		Geosyntec	T: (561) 995-0900 F: (561) 995-0925 E: tomp@geosyntec.com
Spath, Peter		Eastman Kodak Company	T: (716) 588-0801 F: (716) 722-4406 E: pspath@kodak.com
Verstuyft, Allen		Chevron Research and Technology	T: (510) 242-3403 F: (510) 242-1792 E: awve@chevron.com
Greene, Lisa (Contractor Support)		Research Triangle Institute	T: (919) 541-7483 F: (919) 541-7386 E: lcg@rti.org

**PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED)**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD**  
**AUGUST 22, 2000**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>
Tatsch, Gene (Contractor Support)	Research Triangle Institute	T: (919) 541-6930 F: (828) 628-0659 E: cet@rti.org

**Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB)**

Friday, November 3, 2000  
9:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

Riviera Hotel  
Las Vegas, Nevada

**AGENDA**

1. Review June 28, August 22 minutes
2. Review action items from June 28, August 22 minutes
3. Subcommittee reports
  - C Performance Based Measurement Systems - Harry Gearhart
  - C Measurement of Source Emissions - Al Verstuyft, Scott Evans
  - C Regulatory Consistency - Zonetta English
4. Update on Accrediting Authority Workgroup Decisions - David Mendenhall
5. Update on DOT/EPA sample shipping issues – David Friedman
6. Update on PT activities
7. Update on ASTM activities - Llew Williams
8. Recommendations on NELAC Standard
9. Open forum issues
10. New business